

14.11.70

THE STORY  
OF

**New Congress—BKD  
Relations: How New  
Congress Broke The  
U. P. Coalition**

Elections held

		Cong 149	
1 <sup>st</sup> 1967	BJS	98	10-03-67
	SSP	44	
	CPM	13	15-04-68
	SP	12	
	PSP	11	
	President's Rule	25-02-68 to 26 Feb 69	
2 <sup>nd</sup> 1969	Cong	211/425	
	BKD	98	26-Feb-69
	BJS	49	4-Mar-74
	SSP	33	
3 <sup>rd</sup> 1974	Cong	215/425	
	BKD	106	4-Mar-74
	BJS	61	30-Aug-77
	CPM	16	
	INC(O)	10	
4 <sup>th</sup> 1977	JP	352/425	
	Cong	95	

CHOWDHARY CHARAN SINGH

183

Congress split 12 Nov 69	
INC(O)	INC(New)
116 MLAs	100 MLAs

21 July 1969 - Bank Nationalisation)

1969 Dec



भारतीय क्रान्तिदल देश की  
महान्तातथा समृद्धि के लिए  
किसी मन्त्र नरें या सुगम मार्ग में  
विश्वास नहीं करता बल्कि

उसके लिए देशवासियों द्वारा किये  
गये घोर परिश्रम, ईमानदारी और  
त्याग में विश्वास करता है।



THE STORY  
Of  
New Congress—BKD  
Relations: How New  
Congress Broke The  
U. P. Coalition

It was on February 14, 1970, that B. K. D. and New Congress had entered into an agreement which contained the following four terms :

1. State Government shall consist of present members of B. K. D. and will not include members belonging to any other party or group represented in the Assembly to-day.
2. The Congress Party in the legislature led by Shri Kamalapati Tripathi will give its full, unconditional support to B. K. D. Government thus formed.
3. There is no desire on the part of Congress Party to seek suspension or dissolution of the Legislature.

CB Gupta 26-02-69 to 17-02-70  
-x- Cong split 12-11-69-70  
CSaoCM from 18 Feb 1970 to  
1 Oct 1970

President's Rule 1-10-70 to  
18-10-70

Tribhuvan 18 Oct 70  
Nonayana 3 Apts 71  
Singh Cong(0)

184

185

4. Congress Party in the Legislature will be prepared to join the Government when the two parties feel that they have come closer in course of working together as also when leaders of the two parties so agree. No member of the Congress Party will be taken in the Government without prior approval of the Leader of the Congress Party.

The State leadership of the New Congress, however, never reconciled itself to a BKD-led Ministry in the State, and was in search of means and excuses for toppling it from the very start. Confabulations to this end were held with the Old Congress right from the month of March to which its several leaders have candidly testified. When this fact was brought to the notice of Smt. Indira Gandhi—and this was done more than once—she saw nothing wrong in it.

Although, during the talks which had led to the Agreement of February 14, there was absolutely no mention, on either side, of BKD's merger in New Congress, yet, at my initiative, the State Executive, in its meeting held on April 10, discussed the proposal out of sheer national interest. A decision, however, was deferred because it could be taken only by the National Conference which was then scheduled to meet some time in following June.

On June 11, during the budget session of the Assembly, Smt. Indira Gandhi sent for me and told me point-blank that, unless B.K.D. merged in New Congress by June 23 on which date the Budget or the Appropriation Bill was to come up for a final vote in the Assembly, State Government

was likely to be toppled, and the Presidential Rule imposed, which many a New Congress and B. K. D. MLA preferred to the coalition Government that was functioning. I told her that I would have to re-think, and would write a letter to her on my return to Lucknow, but that my reactions were likely to be those of any self-respecting man placed in similar circumstances. That, B. K. D. was a democratic party and a final decision in regard to merger could not be taken by me or the State Executive.

As two Opposition Leaders told me on June 23, that word from New Congress benches had reached them on that day as also on June 12 that, if they asked for a division, New Congress members were willing to vote down the Government. They refused the offer, however, because the gentleman whom New Congress could possibly provide for leadership of the State Government, was not acceptable to them.

Despite all this, I secured a mandate from the State Convention of the party held in Lucknow on June 27 and 28, that I was free, in consultation with the National Executive, to take a decision regarding merger provided I was convinced it will serve national interest and consistent with BKD's self-respect. On July 4 and July 5, however, the National Executive, majority where of was vehemently opposed to merger, asked me to study the question further, and report to it at the next meeting. On the day preceding, I had received a tempting offer, obviously, as consideration for merger, which I declined.

Consequent on the above decision of the National Executive, the New Congress launched a campaign of misrepre-

sentation against BKD in the press in violation of truth and all canons of propriety. *Inter alia*, threats were held out that, in case B.K.D. refused to merge, Congress support to Government would be with-drawn. Smt. Indira Gandhi, however, did not utter a single word of disapproval. BKD suffered this sustained attack in silence except for the following brief statement which I had made on August 12 after Shri Kamalapati Tripathi had formally asked for meetings of his organisation on August 22 and 23 for the purpose of condemning and threatening BKD, that is, just on the eve of the next meeting of its National Executive scheduled for August 26 and 27, which was to take a final decision on merger :

"For quite a considerable time now, the question of BKD's relations with Congress has been discussed and certain charges hurled against me almost daily in the Press. In order that bitterness may be avoided, I have refrained from taking any notice of these outpourings till date. Briefly, it is a deliberate mis-statement to say that BKD is trying to strengthen itself at the expense of Congress. On the contrary, BKD workers are chafing under the restraints I have imposed upon them, particularly, since nominations of candidates for election to the Council of States and the Legislative Council were made in March last.

"The ratio of Congress Ministers to BKD Ministers in the Cabinet stands at 13:10 including myself. Portfolios between the two parties are as equally balanced as possible. So far as I know, both BKD and Congress Ministers treat the members of both the parties alike. But if some Congressmen are still disgruntled, then it should not be forgotten

that there were some men of BKD also who feel equally frustrated, if not more.

"As for the need of a Coordination Committee, well, it may be required only when more than two or three parties constitute a coalition and none of them singly enjoys a majority over others. But a demand for such a Committee by the major partner when only two parties constitute the Government, is simply un-understandable. A Coordination Committee in our case is unnecessary for yet another reason, viz., by the manner in which the Cabinet functions to-day, one can not distinguish a BKD Minister from a Congress Minister. If Government had committed any political sins or proved tyrannical and reactionary in enacting certain Ordinances, particularly, those relating to preventive detention and students' unions, then both parties are equally responsible.

"It has been said and hinted more than once that Congress will withdraw its Ministers from the Cabinet if BKD or I do not 'behave' or continue to behave in the manner we are doing unless merger takes place immediately. I have two replies to make :

- (i) Congress is committed to unconditional support; and
- (ii) merger was no condition of the coalition.

"To put it mildly, BKD's need of a coalition was, in no case, greater than that of Congress. If BKD has been talking of merger, it has been doing so almost since 1968 in the larger interest of the country and successful functioning of democracy. It is not as a price of coalition that we have



offered to consider merger. The climate of hostility, however, that has been sought to be built up against BKD, is a deterrent to dispassionate consideration of the issues involved rather than an encouragement. Congressmen must realise that while our decision to merge, will strengthen Congress considerably, BKD will be sacrificing a name, a flag, a symbol and an organization.

"It has been suggested in certain quarters that while it is a partner in the State Government, B. K. D. has been hobnobbing with the Syndicate and thus kept its options open. Now, this is an un-mitigated lie. As almost everybody who is interested in public affairs knows, the truth is the other way round.

"I may conclude by saying that, handicapped as I am, *inter alia*, by almost constant sniping and unmerited and malicious criticism by those who were expected to support the Government, I stand greatly disillusioned. If another spell of President's rule or a combination with other parties will suit them, let those in the Congress Party who never reconciled themselves to the present arrangements, convince their leadership, on whose telling me so, BKD will chart or will have to chart out its course accordingly. But, for God's sake, open threats and accusations in whatsoever language they are clothed, and, if possible, manoeuvrings also, must cease in the meanwhile. They do no honour to anybody and only serve to generate a climate of instability in the State, which is not conducive to public interest.

"I may add that I propose not to enter into any public controversy on this question till a final conclusion either way

is reached. If I have made this statement today, it is only because my self-respect and that of BKD so demanded."

Several M.Ps. belonging to New Congress urged upon the Prime Minister to intervene and get the Congress meeting postponed to a later date, but she would not agree. Presumably, it was at her own suggestion that the meetings had been convened. In view of the virulent propaganda that had been unleashed against BKD, particularly, at Congress meetings of Aug. 22 and 23, the National Executive came to the conclusion that intention of New Congress were not clean, and took the only honourable course that, in the circumstances, was open to it. The resolution it approved in this regard, ran as follows :

"For reasons which need not be stated, the National Executive of the Bharatiya Kranti Dal decided that the question of its merger with the Congress led by Mrs. Indira Gandhi which had been raised by the U.P. unit of the B. K. D. on its own, and later entrusted by its National Executive to the Chairman for study, be dropped.

The view of the BKD regarding the desirability of reduction in the number of democratic parties and groups in the country, however, remains unchanged. Whenever, an opportunity for making a contribution to this consumation offers itself in future, BKD will try to avail of it with eagerness.

The National Executive, however, hopes that the present coalition Government in U.P. will continue to function as before. As stated by the BKD legislature Party of U. P. in its resolution of

August 25, we would prefer an alliance with new Congress to that with any other party.

The State coalition Government till this date has continued to function smoothly, perhaps, as smoothly as a Government comprised wholly of representatives drawn from one single party has, or could have ever done."

One fails to understand how a grievance could be made of BKD's refusal to merge, and yet it is this which in reality was the head and front of BKD's offence. All other charges were fabrications or pretexts for precipitating an attack on BKD once the prospects of merger had disappeared or become thin. Still, I would like to discuss them just for information of the people, if not for anything else.

There was a blanket charge that in the bargain of a coalition, BKD had been the gainer and New Congress the loser all along the line. This had no basis in facts. New Congress was given a representation in Government according to its strength at the time the coalition was formed—which no majority party in coalitions is ever given. What is more : I did not look into the antecedents of the colleagues that New Congress chose for me. BKD withdrew its candidate for the Legislative Council in Shahjahanpur district in favour of the New Congress candidate who won the seat as a consequence. Out of 13 seats for the Legislative Council in the Biennial Election, we were given only one and had to be content with it. In order simply to oblige New Congress, we gave up one seat for the Rajya Sabha and exchanged another for one to the Vidhan Sabha out of those elected by the Assembly. We offered the Sultanpur Parliamentary seat

held by BKD to a Congress candidate who romped home with victory. There were only two important posts, viz., Chairmanship of the Housing Board and the Vice-Chairmanship of the State Evaluation Board which are manned by non-legislators, and both of them went to New Congress. Much against my better judgment, I agreed to abolition of land revenue on holdings of a size of a 5 bighas or less simply in order to meet New Congress half-way. As regards nominations to various committees made by Govt., well, BKD was greatly discriminated against. Lastly, there can be no denying the fact that the talk of BKD's merger with New Congress served greatly to weaken the former and strengthen the latter. Many a public worker who would have otherwise joined BKD, refrained from doing so; some of them joined New Congress.

As the public is aware, a hue and cry was raised when portfolios were re-distributed consequent on expansion of Cabinet on July 19. As a matter of fact, four new departments were handed over to the Congress Ministers. One important deptt. held by a BKD Minister was allotted to a senior Congress Minister at his desire and no department already held by the Congress group of Ministers on July 19, was taken away. Yet, it was propagated that portfolios had been re-shuffled to the detriment of New Congress. This was an unmitigated lie.

The talk of policy differences over the Ordinances was a sham. The Control of Goondas Ordinance which had to be promulgated as the law and order situation in the State was deteriorating, was merely a replica of similar legislation in our own State in the olden days and existing legislation in

seven States of the Union, today. The legislation was not only unanimously approved by the Joint Select Committee of the Legislature but made more stringent than Government had originally proposed. As for the law relating to Preventive Detention, it exists in some five States governed by the Congress and had been suggested by the Union Government itself in November, 1969. The Ordinance aimed against the compulsory nature of the Student Unions in Degree Colleges and Universities, has been an unqualified success inasmuch as it has saved the student community from unhealthy diversion, giving relief to the parents and teachers alike, as also helped to inculcate a sense of discipline and genuine purpose in our young generation reading in colleges and Universities, and was welcomed by the community in general. There are no compulsory Unions in the Centrally-governed Universities of Aligarh and Varanasi, and none in the Universities of Poona and Bombay. Yet, it has been assailed by our friends of the New Congress as the greatest sin that BKD could commit.

The illegal strike of electricity workers organised by some unpatriotic elements, although 76 demands of 120 or so which they had made, had been completely accepted, 18 partially accepted and the rest were under examination by a committee, was successfully curbed, without the people even knowing that a strike was on. Success of Govt.'s efforts in this matter also chagrined the New Congress leadership still further. They would have been happy, had the life of the community been disrupted and they were able to lay the blame at the door of BKD leadership of the State Government. They made a determined attempt in this direction as the speeches of Sri Kamalapati Tripathi and Sri H.N. Bahuguna made in a meeting of electricity workers held in

Worth  
investigating  
what CS  
did!

194

Lucknow on September 19, would go to show. (It will not be out of place to mention here the speeches that three New Congress M. Ps. from Delhi made at the State Employees' gathering sponsored by dismissed hands on September 21. They were on a par with the speeches that Communists all over the country have been making since independence in order to subvert democracy.)

The decision to take over the Medical College of Lucknow by Government was also made an object of criticism, unmindful of the fact that a previous Health Minister of Congress Govt., viz., Sri Dau Dayal Khanna and the then Chief Minister Srimati Sucheta Kripalani, had taken a decision in this regard in 1965. A few years earlier, viz., in 1958, the then Health Minister Thakur Hukum Singh and Chief Minister Dr. Sampurnanand put on record their opinion that the affairs and administration of the Lucknow Medical College and Associated Hospitals were not satisfactory and decided that, at least, the administration of the hospitals might be taken over immediately. Nor could it by any stretch of meaning be called a decision of policy.

Postponement of take-over of the sugar factories by another season has been seized upon by these friends as a very convenient handle with which, they hope, they will be able to delude the peasantry. The responsibility for this decision is being laid exclusively at my door, as if a Government decision in this regard could be taken all by one man!! In fact, as everybody know by now, it was the Central Government led by the New Congress itself which was directly responsible. The State Government had, through several letters and several interviews and deputations, urged upon

195



the Central Government that if it was not itself willing to nationalise the industry, then, as provided by Article 258 of the Constitution, it should, at least, agree to delegate to the State Government its power of doing so, which the Central Government admittedly possessed, and which, according to our learned Advocate General, Pt. Kanhaiya Lal Misra, and the Law Secretary of the Government of India itself, the State Government did not possess. For reasons best known to it but which are not difficult to guess, the Government of India did not accede to the importunities of the State Government, although in its inaugural session held at Bombay in December, 1969, the New Congress had made a demand upon Government for nationalization of sugar-mills of U.P., in particular. Nor did the Central Govt. take any step in this direction, for example, issue of an Ordinance which it could easily do, during the period the Assembly stood suspended and all powers vested in the hands of Smt. Indira Gandhi, viz., Oct. 2 to Oct. 18. The game of New Congress in maligning B.K.D. was given away completely by a Congress Minister of the Central Govt. itself on October 17 as the following press report would show :

**"NO EARLY SUGAR TAKE-OVER, ASSURES SHINDE"**

KANPUR : October 17—Union Minister of State for Food and Agriculture, Mr. Anna Saheb P. Shinde, assured sugar industrialists that for the next one year or so there was no question of nationalisation of sugar mills and the mill-owners should not sit on the ores about modernisation of the industry.

Mr. Shinde who was addressing the 37th annual convention of the Sugar Technologists Association of

India here yesterday, said that Government of India had appointed an inquiry commission regarding the sugar mills and it would not be possible for it to give its report before next year. (Vide the 'Pioneer', dated Oct. 18, 1970.)

In this connection of nationalisation of sugar factories as also all other decisions mentioned above, it is perhaps unnecessary to remind the public that they were all taken unanimously by the Cabinet which consisted of 13 Ministers of the Congress as against 8 and, later 10 of the B.K.D.

It was also unabashedly propagated that I had accepted millions of money from factory-owners. Maybe, judging by their own standards, my accusers honestly believed in what they said. I had, therefore, requested Smt. Indira Gandhi on June 11 and written a letter to her on September 3 demanding an enquiry into the allegations, secret or open, whether by the CBI or the judiciary but, despite a press report published to this effect on or about Sept. 20, neither the State Govt. nor I have received a reply till date. It will be an important event in the public life of our State if such an enquiry could be ordered simultaneously into the conduct of my accusers and their supporters, both in Delhi and Lucknow. Nobody need be surprised if the enquiry established that the boot was on the other leg not only in this, but in countless other cases.

To revert to policy differences : BKD's policies are mostly given in its election manifesto. I claim that no Congressman, in fact, no sensible public worker, conversant with the problems of the country, can possibly differ from them. Yet, it now seems, the New Congressmen were ultimately in the



have created untold problems for the country, had they so liked. Pakistan was anxiously waiting in its wings for an opportunity. We know too well the trouble which only two States (out of 562 in the country), viz., Kashmir and Hyderabad, that were kept out of the Sardar's charge, have cost the country. "Privy purse settlements," said Sardar Patel, while delivering his speech on the subject in the Constituent Assembly on October 12, 1949, "are, therefore, in the nature of a consideration for the surrender by the rulers of all their ruling powers and also for the dissolution of their States as separate units." Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru concurred. The constituent Assembly concurred. In fact, all those whom we considered, and still revere, as our leaders, concurred. Failure to carry out our part of the agreement, Sardar Patel added, would be a "breach of faith"—a moral wrong. And what is morally wrong, Mahatma Gandhi taught us, cannot be politically right.

The argument that abolition of the privy purse will strengthen and ensure success of democracy, is pure bunkum. Advanced countries like Britain and Japan are not less democratic or less progressive for maintenance of their kings and princes. Royalty was not abolished even by socialist parties when they came into power in these countries. It must be remembered that our ex-rulers do not possess any powers over their fellowmen today, and that no nation can solve its problems or become great and prosperous by slogans but only through hard work.

In abolishing the privy purse—let us remind ourselves—we will be abolishing not property but "consideration" (rather, a solatium) which we undertook to pay for property

or whatever rights the ex-rulers once possessed—which undertaking, for their satisfaction, was written by the founding fathers into the Constitution itself. The ex-rulers may, in other words, also be called pensioners of the State—pensioners for three or four generations only. So that in abolishing the privy purse we will be abolishing pensions which, perhaps, no State in the world except when it came into existence as the result of a bloody revolution, has ever abolished. So far as privileges are concerned, they are mere baubles which the ex-rulers were prepared, or, would have agreed, to forego without much of an argument.

On the analogy of the privy purse, the New Congress would feel justified tomorrow in scrapping the Zamindari Abolition Bonds which were issued by Congress Governments to the ex-zamindars all over the country as compensation for their proprietary rights. One should not be surprised if this act of the Union Government proves a thin end of the wedge and leads to abrogation altogether of the fundamental right to private property embodied in our Constitution for which 'Young Turks' sitting on the band-wagon of the New Congress, are already clamouring. On November 3 last, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, a Minister of State for Finance in the Union Govt., declared at a meeting of the Press Club at Raipur that "majority of New Congress M.Ps. were in favour of abolishing the fundamental right to property guaranteed in the Constitution and replacing it by a mere legal right"—which means a right that Govt. could take away at will.

Our people must know, however, that democracy is founded upon private ownership of property. The individual

who owns nothing, will find himself helpless against a state where it is the rulers or politicians who own or control everything. He will have no freedom of action or any means of *self expression* like houses to construct or modify and crops to grow and tend, or trees to plant, and cows—or even children—to rear. Under the blueprint of communism, children must be kept in creches maintained by the state.

It is contended that abolition of the privy purse will ensure for social justice. In this context, again, we will do well to recall the words of Sardar Patel. "Need we cavil then at the small—and I purposely use the word "small"—price, "said he, "that we have paid for the bloodless revolution which has affected the destinies of millions of our people?" The rulers had handed over some 77 crores of rupees to the Union and this amount at the bank rate of 7 per cent could yield Rs. 5.39 crores as against the privy purse total of Rs. 4.7 crores. As the privy purse was liable to reduction at every succession, this amount, too, would have been gradually reduced to an insignificant within a span of some 50 years or so from now.

There is yet another very relevant circumstance in this connection, which should not be lost sight of. While Rs. 4.7 crores of rupees every year were sought to be saved, Prime Minister had offered to pay the ex-rulers some 45 crores cash down as *quid pro quo*—an offer they refused. Which means that only a saving of (Rs. 4.7 crores—Rs. 3.15 crores of interest at the rate of 7 per cent per annum on an amount of Rs. 45 crores =) Rs. 1.55 crores per annum would have resulted to the exchequer. This further proves that the move for abolition of the privy purse was a mere political stunt, and not actuated by any public or national interest.

On the other hand, arrears of Income-Tax and Corporation Tax of the Central Govt realisable immediately, stood this year at Rs. 508.0 crores after excluding amounts under appeal, stay orders, or revision of assessment. This amount, let the people remember, is payable by big Capitalists and industrialists, and is equivalent to 180 times the amount of the privy purse. At the rate of 7 percent it will bring an interest of Rs. 35.5 crores per annum :

If disparities in incomes in India have worsened and unemployment has increased during the last more than twenty years of political independence, our people should know that it is Congress which is responsible rather than anybody else. Swaraj has proved a hey-day for capitalists and industrialists who have succeeded in multiplying their wealth incredibly during this period. To quote the figures relating to the Birlas and the Tatas alone :

FIGURES OF GROSS ASSETS IN CRORES OF RUPEES

	Years			
	1951	1958	1964	1968
Birlas	65	159	293	576
Tatas	152	389	418	585

(The figures of 1947 when the British left the country, are not available to us, nor the present-day figures of 1970 to which their wealth might have swollen.)

The agreement under which electric energy is supplied to the Hindustan Aluminium Company of the Birlas from the Rihand Project in our own State, results in a loss of Rs. 2.5 crores to the exchequer of Uttar Pradesh yearly. This

act of gross betrayal of the masses by Congress leaders has a story behind it into which I will not go here : suffice it to say that it was the immediate cause of my resignation in 1959. The old policy of laying emphasis on big or heavy industries and thus favouring the rich as compared with small enterprises, however, still continues. Only six months ago, that is, immediately after the inaugural session of the New Congress at Bombay was over, Birlas were sanctioned a fertilizer plant of sixty crores to be set up at Goa.

To give another very pertinent example of the double standards of the Prime Minister or the ruling party : They paid just two hundred per cent of the market value for shares which the bankers or financiers held in the 14 banks that were nationalised last year :

Sl. No.	Name of the Bank	Paid-up value of a share	Market value of a share (On July 18, 1969)	Compensation for a share
1.	Central Bank	25.00	51.30	92.11
2.	Bank of India	50.00	98.50	181.48
3.	Punjab National	10.00	23.50	51.50
4.	Bank of Baroda	50.00	93.50	168.00
5.	United Commercial	50.00	68.13	128.15
6.	Kanara Bank	50.00	68.13	128.15
7.	United Bank of India	10.00	8.55	15.61
8.	Dena Bank	50.00	62.00	144.00
9.	Union Bank of India	5.00	6.56	12.40
10.	Allahabad Bank	100.00	260.00	327.78
11.	Bharatiya Bank	100.00	125.00	255.56
12.	Bank of Maharashtra	50.00	53.00	76.67
13.	Indian Overseas	100.00	117.50	250.00
14.	Syndicate Bank	100.00	143.80	325.17

The question arises : Why this discrimination ? I leave it to the readers themselves to find the answer which is not difficult to know.

Social justice along with maintenance of human dignity is possible only within the framework of an economic set-up such as was envisaged by Gandhi Ji—provided we possessed the necessary understanding and the necessary will-power to establish it. In consonance with the resolution of the State BKD convention held in Kanpur in December last, I had pleaded with Smt. Indira Gandhi on more than one occasion that a law demarcating the sphere of small and big industries might be placed on the Statute-Book under which existing mills that are manufacturing goods, which can be produced on a small scale, for example, textiles, shall be prohibited from selling their products within the country, and will have to export them. Government will do all that it can, to help them compete in foreign markets. If they can not so compete, they may well close down, but the internal market shall remain the preserve of small industry. Once the decision was taken—and taken firmly—small, labour-intensive enterprises will fill the vacuum without loss of time, and the Frankenstein of unemployment and mounting disparities in incomes of our people will have been laid to rest without the Government having to lose a moment's sleep over it. According to the Report of the Textile Enquiry Committee (1953), the employment potential in the handloom industry is nearly twenty times that it is in the mill industry, yard for yard, and that in the power-loom, five times.

It needs a lion's heart, however, that is, great moral and political courage, to alienate the vested interests and the reply dated August 8, that I received from the Prime



Minister's Joint Secretary, said that my proposal regarding compulsory export of mill-made goods that could be produced by handicrafts or small industry, was not practicable. The arguments advanced, are puerile. New Congress or its leadership is dallying before the people schemes like creation of the unemployment fund of 200 crores of Rupees of Governmental Jobs for the number of 5 lakhs every year simply in order to seduce the unwary into voting for New Congress knowing all the while that the jobs will not bring any relief to the masses, but will serve to increase prices.

As regards BKD's link-up with landed interests which the critics pretend to see in BKD's vote on the privy purse : it should be sufficient to point only to our election manifesto and to one feature alone of land reforms enacted in Uttar Pradesh which were inspired by the ideology that is now contained in this manifesto. *Throughout the country landlords were permitted by the Planning Commission or the Government of India to resume land held by tenants, irrespective of the nature of their tenure, up to a prescribed limit of three times the family holding and even more, for personal cultivation. Implementation of this recommendation led to large-scale ejection of tenants. On my insisting, however, the State Government of U. P. refused to accept the advice of the Planning Commission and did not allow a single tenant in U. P. to be ejected. On the contrary, through an amendment of the law in 1954, which was stoutly opposed by some of the leading, so-called socialist members of the Congress Government, permanent rights of Sirdari were conferred on all those who were entered as sub-tenants, tenants of *sir* and *Khudkasi* or even as trespassers in revenue papers, and were known as *Adhivasis* under the Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act of 1950. These poor tillers of soil were summarily thrown out by the land-lords in all*

other States although they were also governed by Congress as U. P. was. From this amendment of law, Harijans stood to benefit greatly, for they constituted one-third of the total number of *Adhivasis* who numbered about 3 million in the State. By the way, it is owing to measures like these, and not to any other factor, that Communism has not been able to establish a foothold in Uttar Pradesh.

In proof of what has been said above, one may refer to a report entitled "Tenorial Conditions and the Package Program" submitted to the Planning Commission by Mr. Wolf Ladejinsky in 1963, an agrarian expert, who had been responsible for introduction of land reforms in Japan while it was under American occupation. He says :

".....Only in Uttar Pradesh has a well thought-out comprehensive legislation been enacted and effectively implemented. There, millions of tenants and sub-tenants were made owners and hundreds of thousands who had been evicted, were restored in their rights!" (page 3)

"Looking back at the agrarian structure of Aligarh (Aligarh was the package district in Uttar Pradesh) after a decade and a half of reform legislation, we have no suggestion either for adding or revising any of it, except with regard to Sirdars to which we have referred earlier. Many a good piece of agrarian reform legislation has arrived still-born in India, but in Uttar Pradesh it went hand-in-hand with enforcement and important attainments. The lesson to be drawn from this is but one : It can be done when there is a will to do it. Millions of falsified record entries can be ferretted out, correct land titles can be recorded and security of tenorial, rights can be brought about" (pp. 57-58).

207

107

The suggestion regarding *Sirdars* to which Mr Wolf Ladejinsky refers, related to the availability of credit to them. Government later on made necessary provisions about it.

The storm which BKD's proposal to lower down the land ceiling to 30 acres in February last, raised largely in the ranks of the New Congress, is already known to the people.

BKD's vote in Rajya Sabha on September 5 on the question of the privy purse was, in fact, a mere cover. Pressure, temptation and blandishment having failed to bring about merger, they decided to break the coalition by a frontal attack, Shri Kamalapati Tripathi's letter of August 30, *inter alia*, asking for a session of Assembly earlier than November 5 as advised by the Business Advisory Committee of the House and a statement of 16 Congress MLAs issued on September 1, delivering an attack on Shri Bali Ram Bhagat, their own Minister at the Centre, for having ventured to say that it was "only a few extremist legislators of U. P. who wanted an immediate break-off with BKD", would go to show that a decision to bring the State Government under their exclusive control had already been taken well before the Privy Purse Bill came up for voting in Parliament. My friends of the New Congress were, in fact, busy undermining the loyalty of BKD members of the Assembly since the evening of July 19 when expansion of the Ministry had left many of the disappointed. On August 31, two Deputy Ministers (one of whom had my permission) were contacted by a Congress leader and offered Ministership. Their efforts took concrete shape on September 3, when 5 BKD members deserted the party on fictitious charges and declared that they had constituted themselves into an independent group.

I had written to Shri Tripathi that a reply to his letter

would be sent to him after our State Executive had considered it on Sept. 15. On Sept. 8, however, he again wrote to me saying that a situation had arisen in which "support by the Congress Party to the State Government had become well-nigh impossible." He, therefore, again called for a meeting of the Assembly, this time, by the end of September and not only endorsed a copy of his letter to the Governor, but released it to the press without even as much as seeking my concurrence. After this second letter, press propaganda against BKD was stepped up still further. Reports of the resolve of the New Congress leadership not to suffer or support the coalition government any longer, became a daily routine. On Sept. 16, I agreed to October 6, the earliest that could be fixed, as the date for summoning the Assembly. The New Congress made it clear beyond doubt, rather declared it from the house-tops, that no adjustment was possible and that the State Government would be brought down on the floor of the House itself as soon as it met on October 6. Despite their public declaration to this effect, none of their Ministers who were all jointly responsible for the so-called "misdeeds" of the State Government, expressed his disassociation with the move of their party either publicly or privately to me, nor did they send up their resignations. They continued to stick to their posts with the intention of joining in the game of pulling down their own government on the appointed date. Such were they who had only seven months ago, offered "full, unconditional support" to B. K. D. in running the State Government in recognition of its having saved their party from disaster !!

As time passed, all pretences to decency were given up. They were openly and unabashedly banking on, and working

for defections, while a Bill illegalising defections had been introduced by their own Government and was pending approval in Parliament. Even some of their Ministers were actively engaged in this holy task. I was told money was also being employed. On Sept. 21, Shri Aziz Imam, General Secretary of the State unit of the New Congress, declared in a statement published in the press next day, that their office was virtually flooded with applications from Members of the Assembly who wanted to join his organization, that applications were being scrutinised and only those who agreed with the policies of the New Congress, will be admitted and, further, that the lucky ones will be "presented" to the prime Minister on her visit to Lucknow on Sept. 23 as a "gift".

Before coming to Lucknow, the Prime Minister had, at Ahmedabad, on Sept. 22, "left no doubt that her party would withdraw its support to the Charan Singh Ministry and explore the possibility of forming an alternate government" (vide the "Indian Express" dated September 24). Thus, relief to the flood-affected areas of Uttar Pradesh was not the sole aim of the Prime Minister's visit to Lucknow: She had other aims also, viz., to secure defections and bring down the Government. She had already, on Sept. 19 or 20 preceding, received in New Delhi some of the MLAs who had defected from B. K. D., and blessed them. Shri Aziz Imam's hopes, however, did not materialise. Only one MLA from Cong. (O) could be presented to the Prime Minister, and a member of New Congress Working Committee and a member of her personal staff who contacted a B. K. D. Minister of State and a B. K. D. MLA who had turned Independent, late in the evening of September 23, were rebuffed

Shri Jagjivan Ram, President of the All India New Congress and a Senior Member of the Union Cabinet, followed with more than one clear, unequivocal appeal to legislators of other parties for defection in the sacred cause of his party's interest. Two highest functionaries in the country, thus, set a precedent for political conduct of which history of democracy till date could not offer an example. One has no way of knowing whether a feeling of remorse on their performance has ever crossed the minds of these two leaders.

It was in these circumstances that my friends of B.K.D. in the State Government and I took a decision at about 11:00 P.M. in the night of Sept. 23, to forestall the New Congress or take it by the horns. It was decided to ask half the number of the New Congress Ministers next day to resign, failing which, to advise the Governor to remove them. Both the Legal Remembrancer and the Advocate-General had advised me that, in asking for removal of Ministers—and any number of them—I was well within my rights.

A joint meeting B.K.D. district Presidents and Secretaries as also the Legislature Party had already met on Sept. 22 and 23, to ponder over the situation. Of the various alternatives that were debated, I insisted on the one which required for my vacating the chair in favour of a Congress nominee, and let the coalition Government function as it was doing, but in view of all that had happened, the meeting would not listen and decided that, if New Congress did not see reason, a coalition with the Opposition parties might be considered. There was no other way out left, they said.

I will not enter here into the details of the sordid drama which the Prime Minister and the Governor enacted in order to suspend the Assembly and thus bring down the Govt. barely three or four days before the House was scheduled to



meet, viz., on Oct. 6. No single act in the country during the last 20 years has brought the Constitution so greatly into contempt and disrepute as the above and, fortunately for the future of democracy, no other act or decision has been so greatly condemned by the political leaders and constitutional experts of the country.

To use a phrase from our history : Infatuated with success in Kerala elections where New Congress had captured hardly 32 seats out of 133—a success which was achieved at the cost of all that Congress had stood for, in the past—it decided to celebrate an “*Ashwamedh Yagya*” (अश्वमेध यज्ञ) for annexation of the entire country. B.K.D., however, avowed that the horse of New Congress shall not “pass” the *Gomati*—and it did not. it was turned back to New Delhi. To the dismay of New Congress, neither the success in Kerala nor the abolition of the privy purse proved the spell or the talisman it was claimed or expected to be. With the election of Shri T. N. Singh as leader of SVD on Oct. 9, the New Congress leaders realised that they had lost, Prospects of a land-slide of 75 members or so from B K.D. and Cong. (O) having foundered a week earlier, they had based their hopes on an unbridgeable rift arising in the SVD on the choice of a leader—which, too, did not come off. Their calculations had, for once, gone all wrong in Uttar Pradesh.

There is no time for self-congratulations, however. B.K.D. has to gird up its loins for the tasks that lie ahead. People have to be educated where their true interest lies. It is a tremendous task, viz , that of educating 550 million people majority of whom are still ignorant of the correct solutions of their problems.

Mall Avenue  
Lucknow U. P.

—Charan Singh  
14-11-1970